## **Monthly complaints report**

Reporting period: 1 March 2020 to 31 March 2020

## **Approaches to the NHPOPC** 112 110 104 99 97 85 82 81 78 72 73 70 65 58 57 56 53 53 53 52 52 49 48 44 39 37 38 37 36 32 30 29 29 27 27 21 Mar-19 Apr-19 Jun-19 Jul-19 Sep-19 Oct-19 Dec-19 Jan-20 May-19 Aug-19 Nov-19 Feb-20 Mar-20 Complaints Approaches (total complaints, enquiries and FOI matters) Enquiries

Complaints by profession March 2020		March 2020	Type of complaint	March 2020	
Medical		19	Notification – complaint by notifier		18
Nursing	9		Registration – process/policy		11
Psychology	y 4		Registration – delay		5
Pharmacy	armacy 2		Freedom of Information		1
Dental	tal 1		Notification – complaint by practitioner		1
Paramedicine 1		1	Notification – complaint by practitioner		I.
Podiatry 1		Other		1	
Total 37		Total		37	
Investigations	March 2020	July 2019 – March 2020	Outcomes on investigations	March 2020	July 2019 – March 2020
Open investigations	45	N/A	Investigated – s 12(4) comments	7	23
Investigations commenced	16	94	provided	. 20	
Investigations finalised	13	107	Investigated – explanation provided by NHPOPC	4	64
Early resolution*/Warm transfers to Ahpra		136	Investigated – assisted resolution	2	18
*Early resolution transfer process commenced 1 September 2019, replacing	9		Investigated – apology provided	0	2
warm transfers					
			Total	13	107

Approach	March 2020		July 2019 – March 2020	March 2019	July 2018 – March 2019
Enquiries	16	♦	260 ↓	37	318
Complaints	37	$\mathbf{\Psi}$	458 个	57	432
FOI matters	0	♦	15 ↓	6	21
Total	53	↓	733 ↓	100	771
Location of cor	mplainant	<ul> <li>Victoria</li> </ul>			
4	1 1		Queensland		
		13	Unknown		
4			New South Wales		
			South Australia		

## **Case study**

Jenny applied for provisional registration. When her application was approved, Ahpra explained that she was required to apply to participate in a Supervised Practice Program (SPP). Although Jenny had not yet been approved to participate in the SPP, she commenced supervised practice.

More than two months later, Ahpra contacted Jenny to advise that her application for the SPP was incomplete. Jenny returned the required information and her application was approved by Ahpra the following day.

Jenny asked Ahpra and the relevant Board to consider whether the two month period in which she practised without approval could be recognised for the purposes of the SPP. This was important to Jenny as she would otherwise be outof-sync with her peers in the SPP.

The Board refused Jenny's request. Jenny complained to the NHPOPC that this was an unfair outcome, as it did not take into account Ahpra's delay in recognising that her application to participate in the SPP was incomplete. The NHPOPC investigated Jenny's complaint. The NHPOPC formed the view that, while Ahpra contributed to the delay in processing Jenny's application, it was open to the Board to exclude the unapproved period from the recognised supervised practice under the SPP.

Please note: our data is subject to change due to ongoing investigations and quality assurance activities. If you have a question about our data, please contact us on 1300 795 265 or by email via complaints@nhpopc.gov.au.



July 2010

National Health Practitioner Ombudsman and Privacy Commissioner

Outside Australia

Western Australia

1.1.1.2.2010